

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 and 18-22 remain pending in the application.

**Allowability of Claims 13, 14, 20 and 21**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indicating that claims 13, 14, 20 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 13, 14, 20 and 21 are amended herein to be in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants respectfully request a notice that claims 13, 14, 20 and 21 are now allowed.

**Claims 1-7, 9-12, 15 and 22 over Nabkel**

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9-12, 15 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,963,626 to Nabkel ("Nabkel"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 15 and 22 recite a system and method of allowing a party calling a telephone answering device to secure a voice message upon a Caller ID information associated with the party calling the telephone answering device matching a pre-stored Caller ID information.

The Examiner ACKNOWLEDGES that Nabkel discloses a voice message is secured with a message PIN or a recipient's PIN at col. 3, lines 53-58 (See Office Action, page 3). A review of Nabkel at col. 3, lines 53-58 confirms that Nabkel discloses a "subscriber may also have the option of specifying security parameters for the communiqué, as shown at block 141. For example, the subscriber may assign a message Personal Identification Number (PIN) associated with the message or a personal PIN associated with a specific individual."

Thus, the Examiner ACKNOWLEDGES that Nabkel discloses allowing a party calling a telephone answering device to secure a voice message upon a PIN information being entered by the party calling the telephone

answering device **NOT** based on TWO pieces of data matching, much less Caller ID information matching pre-stored Caller ID information, i.e., allowing a party calling a telephone answering device to secure a voice message upon a Caller ID information associated with the party calling the telephone answering device matching a pre-stored Caller ID information, as recited by claims 1-7, 9-12, 15 and 22.

Moreover, Nabkel does appear to disclose use of an identity of a calling party. However, Nabkel discloses use of identity of a calling party to tailor “a voice message or textual message for receipt by the calling party” (See Abstract). Thus, Nabkel uses an identity of a calling party to tailor a voice message or textual message to the calling party **NOT** to secure a voice message, as recited by claims 1-7, 9-12, 15 and 22.

A benefit of a system and method of allowing a party calling a telephone answering device to secure a voice message upon a Caller ID information associated with the party calling the telephone answering device matching a pre-stored Caller ID information is, e.g., automating SECURITY of a voice message that is controlled by an owner of a telephone answering device. Caller ID service is provided by a telephone service provider and is automatically transmitted to a subscriber. By basing SECURITY on Caller ID information, an owner of a telephone answering device can therefore establish which callers are given an option to have their voice messages secured. In contrast, Nabkel requires a user to ENTER a PIN to secure a message, lacking any type of automation from a security process. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features having such benefits.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-7, 9-12, 15 and 22 are patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim 8 Nabkel in view of Oberlander**

In the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nabkel in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,865 to Oberlander et al. (“Oberlander”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 8 recites a system of allowing a party calling a telephone answering device to secure a voice message upon a **Caller ID information** associated with the party calling the telephone answering device matching a pre-stored Caller ID information.

As discussed above, Nabkel fails to disclose or suggest a system of allowing a party calling a telephone answering device to secure a voice message upon a **Caller ID information** associated with the party calling the telephone answering device matching a pre-stored Caller ID information, as recited by claim 8.

Oberlander is relied on to disclose a multimedia messaging system that uses a message header that includes a destination ID and a personal ID of a recipient (See Office Action, page 6). However, Oberlander fails to even mention anything related to security, much less message security, much less a system of allowing a party calling a telephone answering device to secure a voice message upon a **Caller ID information** associated with the party calling the telephone answering device matching a pre-stored Caller ID information, as recited by claim 8.

Thus, even if Nabkel were theoretically modified by Oberlander (which one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Oberlander’s system of message routing for features to modify a voice messaging system), the theoretical result would STILL fail to disclose or suggest a system of allowing a party calling a telephone answering device to secure a voice message upon a **Caller ID information** associated with the party calling the telephone answering device matching a pre-stored Caller ID information, as recited by claim 8.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 8 is patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William H. Bollman', written over a horizontal line.

William H. Bollman  
Reg. No. 36,457

**Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC**

2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df